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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Comments

[1] The current presentation of each clinical problem/condition (Specific methods for clinical topics) might be clearer if a table is used to summarize information for the database. Below are the major table sections (A, B, C) – each would list several measures.

(A) Outcome Assessment(s)

(B) Published Study Predictor Data
   1 - diagnostic indices
   2 - study design and quality indices

(C) Individual Patient Predictor Data not reported in B) but presumably available
   1 - clinical history / demographic
   2 - physical examination
   3 - additional (standard-of-care) assessments

Readers would be familiar with meta-analysis results using (A) and (B1). The submitted document proposes the compilation of a more extensive database consisting of (A), (B) and (C) information. Thus, in this large database research activity (IPD meta-analyses and generation of prediction algorithms) can examine the additional usefulness of (C); which will be of interest amongst the clinical/medical and statistical readership.

[2] In the Discussion Section, the authors could elaborate on how a clinician would obtain and use results/routines generated from the large database. For a new
patient; what information needs to be documented, how is this submitted for evaluation and what can be expected in the returned result(s).
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